

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,399	01/23/2004	Joseph Frank Loprete	20711-0036	9501
26587 75	590 07/17/2006		EXAM	INER
MCNEES, WALLACE & NURICK LLC 100 PINE STREET			BANKHEAD, GENE LOUIS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 1166 HARRISBURG	G, PA 17108-1166		20711-0036 9501 EXAMINER BANKHEAD, GENE LOUIS	
	•		DATE MAILED: 07/17/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/764,399	LOPRETE, JOS	EPH FRANK
and the Common!	Examiner	Art Unit	
Office Action Summary		3744	
The MAILING DATE of this communi	Gene L. Bankneau	with the correspondence	address
The MAILING DATE of this communication for Reply	Cauon appears on are	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(30) DAYS.
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MARKET SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum state Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply Any reply received by the Office later than three months a carned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, nowever, may nunication.	ONTHS from the mailing date of th	is communication.
atus			
	ed on <u>24 January 2003</u> .		
1) Responsive to communication (*)	2b)⊠ This action is non-final.	notters prosecution as to	the merits is
2a) This action is FINAL . 3) Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the pract	i for allowance except for formal m tice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 (C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
disposition of Claims			
4)	rejected. s/are objected to.		
Application Papers	the Evaminer		
9) The specification is objected to by 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/a	the Examinor.	ed to by the Examiner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is a second of the drawing sheet (s) include the control of the drawing sheet (s) include the control of the declaration is objected.	ibjection to the arange,	ewing(s) is objected to. Set	5(a). ₉ 37 CFR 1.121(d) _{orm} PTO-152.
12) Acknowledgment is made of a classified copies of the price	prity documents have been received ority documents have been received pies of the priority documents have pressional Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)	ed. ed in Application No e been received in this N)).	 lational Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Rev 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	view (PTO-948)	nterview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Applic Other:	cation (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 3744

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7 recites the limitation, "predetermined operating conditions". There is no previous mention to a "predetermined operating conditions" in claims 1,5, or 6, from which claim 7 depend. Therefore it is not clear as to what constitutes this limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1,2,5,6, 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alsenz (5035119) in view of Alsenz (US4951475).

With regard to claims 1,2,5, and 6 Alsenz '119 discloses a refrigeration system comprising two compressors 218 and 220; a condenser 216; and two evaporators 214 and 215 in fluid connection with the compressors (see Figure 1).

Art Unit: 3744

Alsenz '119 further teaches a control system 200 and 221 capable of controlling the two compressors capacity selection (column 16 lines 63-68). Alsenz '119 does not teach a system wherein each compressor has a plurality of discrete output capacities. Alsenz '475 discloses a refrigeration system with multiple compressors 12 and 16 having discrete output capacities (column 5 lines 54-59 and column 6 lines 22-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Alsenz '119 to incorporate the on/off compressors of Alsenz '475 into the system as it well known in the art discrete capacity compressors are more cost-efficient to operate than constant capacity compressors.

Alsenz '119 further discloses a refrigeration system capable of performing the method of claims 11 and 12, as recited.

Alsenz does not teach a system wherein each multi-capacity compressor has a plurality of discrete output capacities and an operational state or a control system to generate the output capacities of each compressor. Alsenz '475 teaches a refrigeration system with compressors 12 and 16 having descrete output capacities (column 5 lines 54-59 and column 6 lines 22-25). Alsenz '475 further teaches a microprocessor controller 10 that controls the output capacity of the system compressors (column 3 lines 49-68 and column 4 lines 1-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Alsenz '119 with Alsenz '475 in order to reduce the cost in operating the refrigeration system. It is well known in the art discrete capacity compressors are more cost efficient the constant capacity compressors.

Art Unit: 3744

With regard to claim 13 and 14 Alsenz 475 teaches a table (Figure 7) with a plurality of configurations of multi-capacity compressors. Alsenz '475 further teaches the system is capable of selecting different configurations of the multiple capacity compressors by providing different stages, each stage having compressor unloading combinations, see Figure 7.

FIG.7 STAGE U₂ C3 Uı C₁ C2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 Ó 2 0 3 0 1 4 1 5

Figure 7 Alsenz (US 4951475)

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alsenz '119 as modified by Alsenz '475 in further view of Shaw (US 4947655).

With regard to claim 9, Alsenz '119 as modified by Alsenz '475 teaches all limitations of claim 6, however fails to teach that the first and second reciprocating compressors 18 and 20 (column 3 lines 29-33 and column 4 lines 28-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Art Unit: 3744

the invention to incorporate the reciprocating compressors of Shaw into the refrigeration system of Alsenz '119 in view of Alsenz '475 because reciprocating compressors advantageously the high-pressure ratios that are needed to operate refrigeration systems more efficiently.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 3,4,10,15, and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gene L. Bankhead whose telephone number is (571)-272-8963. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler can be reached on (571)-272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3744

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CHERYL TYLER * SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER Examiner Art Unit 3744 GB